**REMARKS**

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, no claims have been canceled, amended or added. Claims 2-6 and 8-17 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

REQUEST FOR INTERVIEW BEFORE OFFICE ACTION

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to discuss the pending claims before issuance of an Office Action.

Applicants believe that a more thorough review of the underlying references and the pending claims will be helpful to further prosecution.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101

At page 2 of the Office Action, claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Office Actions asserts:

> Claim 17 must contain language stating that the program is executed by a computer processor. The preamble of claim 17 should read, for example, "A computer-readable medium storing at least one program, when executed by a computer processor, controlling a moving image processor according to a process comprising:". See MPEP 2106.

*Office Action*, page 2, lines 8-11. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Applicants respectfully note, as has been noted earlier in prosecution, that claim 17 clearly recites "A machine readable storage storing at least one program controlling a moving image processor according to a process comprising..." In other words, claim 17 is directed to a stored program controlling a processor according to a method. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 17 is directed to statutory subject matter as is.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

At page 2 of the Office Action, claims 13 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,111,511 issued to Ishii et al. ("Ishii"). The reasons for the rejection

are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Regarding claim 13, the rejection is traversed because Ishii fails to teach or suggest at least:

> a motion detector detecting motion information values representing presence and absence of a motion for each pixel/block of an input nth image field

The Examiner cites column 1, lines 6-8 for teaching or suggesting the motion detector feature of claim 13. This section states in its entirety:

> The present invention relates to a motion vector detecting apparatus for detecting a motion quantity of an image based on a moving image signal.

The Applicants fail to see how this teaches or suggests detecting motion information values... for each pixel/block of an input nth image field. That is, the Applicants respectfully submit that Ishii cannot be relied upon for suggesting detecting motion for each pixel or block of an image field. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that Ishii cannot properly be relied upon for teaching or suggesting the motion detector feature as it is recited in claim 13.

The Applicants respectfully submit that since Ishii fails to teach or suggest all of the features of claim 13, this claim is allowable over Ishii. Thus, withdrawal of the 102(b) rejection is respectfully requested.

Regarding the rejection of claim 16, this claim depends directly on independent claim 13, and is therefore believed to be allowable for at least the reasons noted above.

At page 3 of the Office Action, claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,568,196 issued to Hamada et al. ("Hamada"). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The rejection is traversed because Hamada fails to teach or suggest at least:

> removing spurious still regions and spurious motion regions during an image field motion detection, based upon a limited added to or a limited subtracted from, pixel motion information values of a current image field using only immediately preceding and succeeding image fields to the current image field

Hamada is directed to a motion adaptive noise reduction filter and motion compensated interframe coding system. The section of Hamada cited by the Examiner for teaching the removing operation recited above states in relevant part:

> The immediately preceding (i-1)th frame from which noise has already been removed by the filter, is stored in the frame memory 5, and this immediately preceding (i-1)th frame is input to the motion compensator 3.

Thus, Hamada actually suggests using only the preceding frame estimating motion. *See also Hamada,* col 3, lines 28-31 ("Motion is estimated in block units by comparing the immediately preceding frame stored in the frame memory 2 with the current frame, and a motion vector (MVx, MVy) is found for each block.").

In contrast, claim 17 recites ... using only immediately preceding <u>and succeeding</u> image fields to the current image field. The Applicants respectfully submit that since Hamada fails to teach or suggest all of the features of claim 17, this claim is allowable over Hamada. Thus, withdrawal of the 102(b) rejection is respectfully requested.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Applicants acknowledge with appreciation that claims 14-15 have been found to contain allowable subject matter. However, the Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 13 is allowable as set forth above. Accordingly, claims 14-15 are believed to be allowable as is.

ALLOWED CLAIMS

The Applicants acknowledge with appreciation that claims 2-6 and 8-12 have been allowed.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. And further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.


Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP


Date: _Ocr 12, 2006_          By: _____
                                    Christopher P. Mitchell
                                    Registration No.  54,946

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C.  20005
Telephone:  (202) 434-1500
Facsimile:  (202) 434-1501